DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 469 CE 073 488

TITLE HRD Models in Europe.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 18p.; In: Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings (Minneapolis, MN, February 29-March 3, 1996); see CE 073 480.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Change Agents; Educational Needs; Education Work Relationship; Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Practices; Foreign Countries; Human Capital; *Human Resources; *Labor Force Development; Learning Strategies; On the Job Training; Organizational Development; Staff Development; *Teacher Role; Teaching Methods; Trainers; Training Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Finland; *Germany

ABSTRACT

This document contains two papers from a symposium on human resource development (HRD) in Europe moderated by Wim Nijhof at the 1996 conference of the Academy of Human Resource Development. "HRD Roles in Germany" (Linda E. Odenthal, Wim J. Nijhof) reports on a German study based on a study of the job profiles of HRD practitioners in the United States. The study suggests an impression of new or changed HRD roles as well as a role profile for the German instructor/facilitator. "HRD Roles in Finland--Preliminary Results" (Tuija Valkeavaara) investigates the typical roles of Finnish HRD practitioners, using a survey based on American Society for Training and Development models for HRD with 461 Finnish practitioners. Survey results showed that the most important HRD roles in Finland seem to be similar to the roles in other European countries. The role of organizational change agent was selected as the most important role, reflecting the current situation in working life. Organizational work context and educational background did not seem to be associated with the role. Papers contain references. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 403 469

SYMPOSIUM
[7] HRD MODELS IN EUROPE

Chair: Wim Nijhof, University of Twente

HRD Roles in Germany
Linda E. Odenthal, University of Twente
Wim J. Nijhof, University of Twente

HRD Roles in Finland—Preliminary Results
Tuija Valkeavaara, University of Jyväskylä

Academy of Human Resource Development
1996 Conference
Minneapolis, MN
February 29-March 3, 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Odenthal

T Valkeavaara

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 073 488

HRD Roles in Germany

Linda E. Odenthal
University of Twente

Wim J. Nijhof
University of Twente

This study, conducted in Germany, is an extension of the study on HRD profiles in Europe, that the University of Twente started in 1992. The survey is based on a study on the job profiles of HRD practitioners in the United States carried out by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). An impression of new or changed HRD roles is obtained as well as a role profile for the German Instructor/Facilitator.

Since 1980 research projects have been carried out concerning the content of Human Resource Development (HRD) jobs. In the first investigations the emerging profession of HRD practitioners and their professionalisation was the incentive (Nadler, 1980). In the recent years quality and standardization of qualifications have become more and more in the focus of interest (McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989; Arnold & Huge, 1990).

In 1992 the University of Twente started with a study on HRD Profiles in Europe. The aim of this study was to contribute to the field description of HRD in Europe. The information gathered in this study could not only contribute to the professionalisation of both the HRD profession and its practitioners but could also be useful in the light of harmonizing qualification structures (de Rijk, Mulder & Nijhof, 1994; van Ginkel, Mulder & Nijhof, 1994).

In 1992, five countries participated in the study of the University of Twente; The United Kingdom, Belgium, Northern Ireland, Italy and The Netherlands. The survey resulted in a description of the context in which HRD practitioners in those countries are working, and in role profiles, consisting of core outputs and core competencies. These role profiles were compared with the eleven role profiles compiled by ASTD in 1989 (de Rijk, Mulder & Nijhof, 1994; van Ginkel, Mulder & Nijhof, 1994).

The aim of the survey in Germany was to do the same for the German practitioners and since the environments in which HRD practitioners function have not been static since 1989, when the ASTD compiled their HRD roles, the survey is also used to obtain an impression of "new" or "changed" HRD roles.

The Design of the Role Study in Germany

In Germany the field of HRD has developed into an essential component of most organizations (Holterhoff & Becker, 1986). The increasing importance of the development of human resources, as one of the strategic factors in private enterprises and public agencies, is not reflected in the information about the HRD field in general and its practitioners in particular (von Bardeleben, Böll, Drieling, Gnahs, Seusing, & Walden, 1990). The available information in Germany in relation to HRD practitioners is incomplete and often descended from studies with another main purpose than gaining information about HRD practitioners (Arnold & Huge, 1990). Until now job profiles of HRD practitioners are indefinitive and HRD roles are indistinctive (Alt, Sauter, & Tillman, 1994).

Job Profiles of HRD Practitioners. In the survey of the ASTD, an HRD job is seen as a set of different roles with different outputs. A role is described as a functional domain defined in terms of outputs and competencies. An output is defined as a product or service that an individual or group delivers to others. A job profile consists of a description of the job content, and an overview of the competencies required to fulfil the role during the next three to five years. A competency is described as 'an area of knowledge or skill that is critical for producing key outputs' (McCullough & McLagan, 1983; McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989).

© *copyright, Odenthal & Nijhof, 1996*

In the ASTD study eleven role profiles were compiled: Marketer, Needs Analyst, Researcher, HRD Materials Developer, Organization Change Agent, Instructor/Facilitator, Program Designer, HRD Manager, Administrator, Individual Career Development Advisor and Evaluator (see table 1).

Table 1 : ASTD roles *(Source: McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989, p.20)*

1. Marketer: The role of marketing and contracting for HRD viewpoints, programmes and services.
2.Needs Analyst: The role of identifying ideal and actual performance and performance conditions and determining causes of discrepancies.
3.Researcher: The role of identifying, developing, or testing new information (theory, research, concepts, technology, models, hardware and so on) and translating the information into its implications for improved individual or organizational performance.
4.HRD Materials Developer: The role of producing written or electronically mediated instructional materials.
5.Organization Change Agent: The role of influencing and supporting changes in organization behavior.
6.Instructor/Facilitator: The role of presenting information, directing structured learning experiences, and managing group discussions and group process.
7.Program Designer: The role of preparing objectives, defining content, and selecting and sequencing activities for a specific intervention.
8.HRD Manager: The role of supporting and leading a group's work, and linking that work with the total organization.
9.Administrator: The role of providing co-ordination and support services for the delivery of HRD programmes and services.
10.Individual Career Development Advisor: The role of helping individuals to assess personal competencies, values and goals and to identify, plan and implement development and career actions.
11.Evaluator: The role of identifying the impact of an intervention on individual or organizational effectiveness.

Since 1986, when the ASTD started with this study, almost ten years have passed. In these past ten years the environments in which HRD practitioners function have not been static. Economic stagnation and organizational developments have put their marks on HRD in Europe. Although HRD is seen as an important strategic factor, companies have also discovered HRD as a cost-center. This increasing awareness of costs makes that HRD departments often have to sell their services to other departments within the company and even to Third Parties (Siegers, 1995). Besides this outsourcing of HRD, 'Total Quality Management' and the 'Learning Organization' present new challenges to HRD practitioners (Feuchthofen & Severing, 1995; Marsick & Watkins, 1992). These changing environments might have led to new or changed roles for the HRD practitioners.

For this reason, the survey in Germany, was not only used to validate the roles of the German HRD practitioners with roles compiled by the ASTD, but was also used to get an impression of new or changing roles of HRD practitioners.

Research Questions. The following research questions were formulated:

1. What are the roles of German HRD practitioners and what are their outputs?
2. Which competencies are necessary to perform the HRD roles and what level of expertise is required?
3. What are the communications between the ASTD roles and those in Germany?
4. Do German HRD practitioners hold other than the ASTD roles?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Methodology

Following the survey procedure of the University of Twente in 1992, the survey in Germany was conducted in cooperation with a professional association that comprises practitioners, working in the field of HRD. This is the Bund Deutscher Verkaufsförderer und Trainer (BDVT), a leading organization of German HRD professionals.

The questionnaire was translated and adapted to German. It had appeared that respondents had difficulties to make a distinction between their whole job and a specific role. For this reason, the division of the German questionnaire was altered to make it clearer and at the same time it was shortened. The questionnaire consisted of four parts. The first part of the questionnaire was to get a description of the context in which the German HRD practitioners function. In part two, jobs were analyzed in terms of job tasks and the eleven ASTD roles. Part three and four were centered around the outcomes and competencies described by McLagan (1989).

Results

Response group The questionnaires were send out on November 1, 1995. The results described in this paper are based on the questionnaires that were returned on December 15, 1995. The questionnaire was mailed to all members of the BDVT, residing in Germany (n=998). Fifteen members were residing in other European countries and received no questionnaire. From the 998 mailed questionnaires, 178 were returned. This is a response rate of 17.8 %, a common response rate for comparable mail surveys. Results of the follow-up conducted in the middle of December were not yet available. From the 178 questionnaires, 170 could be included in the analysis. Eight questionnaires were left out because they were not completed for various reasons.

At this point little can be said about the representativeness of the response group. As already mentioned, little is known about the whole population, the German HRD practitioner. Even the most fundamental data, like for example the total number of HRD practitioners, do not exist (Alt, Sauter & Tillman, 1994). An additional problem is the law that protects the privacy of the individual. Organizations are often not allowed to give the scarce information they possess to a third party.

New or Other Roles of German HRD Practitioners. The respondents were asked whether there were other roles than the eleven ASTD roles in their job.

Of the 170 respondents 62 (36.5%) answered that they fulfil, in their job, one or more roles different from the eleven ASTD roles. To be able to categorize the roles, based on the description that the respondents gave, the following four categories were defined.

1. Roles of the ASTD; These roles were mentioned as 'different', but from the description it appeared that it was one of the eleven original roles of the ASTD.
2. Roles inside the Human Resource area; Roles situated in the HR area but not in the HRD area as defined by McLagan. The HRD area is within the larger human resource area. This larger area includes the other organizational functions that affect people's performance but do not use development as their primary mechanism of influence (McLagan, 1989, p.3).
3. Roles outside the HR area; Roles that are not situated in one of the area's of HR as described in the Human Resource Wheel (McLagan, 1989, p.6).
4. Potential new HRD roles; New HRD roles that are situated in the HRD areas; Training and Development, Organization Development and Career Development (McLagan, 1989, p.6).

Table 2 : New or Changed Roles of German HRD practitioners (n=62)

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Roles of ASTD	31	40.8
2. Roles inside Human Resource area	10	13.2
3. Roles outside Human Resource area	15	19.7
4. Potential new HRD roles	20	26.3
(missing=0)		
Total	86*	100.0

(* respondents could name more than one role)

Roles in category 1. Roles comparable to the role of INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR and the role of HRD MANAGER were mentioned both six times. The NEEDS ANALYST was mentioned four times, the RESEARCHER and ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT both three times. Roles comparable to the MARKETER, HRD MATERIALS DEVELOPER and PROGRAM DESIGNER were mentioned twice. ADMINISTRATOR, CAREER ADVISOR and EVALUATOR once.

Roles in category 2. In this category, five times roles from the area of EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE were mentioned, two times roles from the HR RESEARCH AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS area and two times the area SELECTION AND STAFFING.

Roles in category 3. The roles mentioned in this category were management roles, other then the HRD MANAGER (seven times) and marketing roles outside the HRD area (six times).

Roles in category 4. In this category two groups of roles were mentioned. The first group was named 'MERCHANT' and the second 'COACH'.

The role of *Merchant* seems to be a combination of elements of four ASTD roles, the MARKETER, HRD MANAGER, ADMINISTRATOR and EVALUATOR and some new elements needed to 'run a business'.

The role of COACH differs from the ASTD role of INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR. The role of INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR stresses on presenting information, directing structured learning experiences, and managing group discussions and group process. A COACH, according to the seven respondents that mentioned it as one of their roles, 'accompanies' an individual or group to a common goal.

Roles that Jobs consist of

The respondents were asked to mark the main roles that their job consist of. Four roles were mentioned by at least 50% of the respondents (n=170). These are the roles of the NEEDS ANALYST, the ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT, the INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR, and the PROGRAM DESIGNER.

The main roles appear to differ per role on which most working time is spent on. As table 3 shows, 121 of the 170 respondents spend most of their working time as INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR. The main roles of this group correspond with the main roles of the whole group respondents. To get a impression whether there is a difference between jobs performed internal and external, the group that spends most time as INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR was split up. Internal are those practitioners employed by an organization which core business is not training and development. External are the independent practitioners and practitioners employed by training and development organizations. The division of the group that spends most of their working time as *Instructor/Facilitators*, in external and internal working, learned that the role of ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT is named by 80% of the external (n=76) and by 37.5% of the internal instructors (n=40) (Five instructors could not be assigned to being internal or external working, they were left out of this analysis).

In the group that spends most working time as ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENTS(N=10), AT LEAST 50% OF MARKED THE FOLLOWING FOUR ROLES; MARKETER, INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR, ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT and HRD MANAGER. The group that spends most working times as MARKETERS (n=8) named also four roles; MARKETER, NEEDS ANALYST, ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT and INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR. The main roles of the group that spends most time as HRD MANAGERS (n=8) are, NEEDS ANALYST, INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR, ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT and HRD MANAGER. The group spending most working time as PROGRAM DESIGNERS (n=6), have the following main roles,

NEEDS ANALYST, HRD MATERIALS DEVELOPER, INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR and PROGRAM DESIGNER. The other roles are not included because of the low number of respondents with these roles as role that takes most of their working time.

Table 3 Role that takes most time (n=170)

Role	Frequencies	Percentage
Instructor/Facilitator	121	71.2
Organization Change Agent	10	5.9
Marketer	8	4.7
HRD Manager	8	4.7
Program Designer	6	3.5
Administrator	3	1.8
Developer of HRD material	4	2.4
Researcher	2	1.2
Merchant	2	1.2
Needs Analyst	0	0.0
Individual Career Advisor	0	0.0
Evaluator	0	0.0
(missing=6)		

The role that takes up most of the working time doesn't need to be the most important role in a job. There can be a role that has for instance more impact. According to 37.6% of the respondents (n=64), the role that takes most working time is at the same time their most important role. For 48.2% of the respondents (n=82) the role that takes most working time is not their most important role. This difference is not significant (Z(n=146)=1.41, 2-Tailed P=.1594). No most important role was mentioned by 24 respondents (14.1%).

As most important role, the role of INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR was named most often (32.4%), followed by the ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT (14.1%). Other roles than the ASTD roles were mentioned together 17 times (11.3%).

As role that would gain importance in the near future, the role of ORGANIZATION CHANGE AGENT was named most often (25%).

Outputs. Compared to the other roles, the role of INSTRUCTOR/FACILITATOR is overrepresented (121 of the 170 respondents). The outputs of the total group of respondents are dominated by this one role. For this reason no table will be presented with outputs of the German HRD practitioner in general. The next tables present the outputs that German *Instructor/Facilitators* realize and the competencies required according to this group.

The criterion for assigning outputs to a the role of *Instructor/Facilitator* was that at least 70% of this group (n=121) realizes the specified output (see table 4). The same criterion for assigning outputs and competencies to a role were used in the survey of the University of Twente in 1992 (de Rijk, Mulder & Nijhof, 1994; van Ginkel, Mulder & Nijhof, 1994). To get more insight into differences between internal or external working *Instructor/Facilitators*, the group was split up. The division showed differences for five of the outputs (marked with *) that were assigned to the role *Instructor/Facilitators* based on the results of the whole group.

Less than 70% of the external instructors realize the output 'Information on Future Forces and Trends'. Less than 70% of the internal instructors realize the outputs 'Group Awareness of their own Group Process' and 'Concepts, Theories, or Models of Development or Change'. According to more then 70% of the internal instructors, ' Individuals with new Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes' and 'Facility and Equipments Selection' belong to the outputs of their role. Of the output 'Individuals with new Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes' should be said that the percentages, 68.4% for the external instructors and 70.0% for the internal instructors, are very close to each other and near to the criterion of 70%.

Table 4 Outputs realized by German Instructor/Facilitators

		Total (n=121)	Extern (n=76)	Intern (n=40)
		>70%		
Behavior Change from a Counseling/Advising Relationship		94.2	96.1	90.0
Presentation of Material		94.2	94.7	92.5
Feedback to Learners		88.4	90.8	85.0
Facilitation of Group Discussions		86.8	85.5	87.5
Facilitations of structured Learning Events	86.0	85.5	90.0	
Transfer of Development or Career Planning Skills to the Learner		82.6	89.5	75.0
Instructor/Facilitator Guides		80.2	75.0	90.0
On-site Programme Support and Staff Management		77.7	72.0	85.0
Concepts, Theories, or Models of Development or Change		76.0	78.9	67.5*
Resolved Conflicts for an Organization or Groups		76.0	78.9	72.5
Group Members' Awareness of their own Group Process		75.2	80.3	67.5*
Functioning Equipment		74.4	72.4	82.5
Individual Action Plans for Learning Transfer	72.7	76.3	72.5	
Information on Future Forces and Trends		71.1	69.7	75.0*
		<70%		
Individuals with new Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes		69.0	68.4	70.0*
Facility and Equipment Selections		55.2	47.4	70.0*

Competencies. For the competencies a criterion has been used that at least 50% of the group thinks that the competence is very important (see table 5). For each of the competencies the level of mastery for an excellent performance in the role was added. For those competencies a division of instructors in two groups, gave only a difference in one competence. According to 68.4% of the external instructors, Negotiation Skills is a very important competence, only 42.5% of the internal instructors thinks the same.

Table 5 Competencies demanded from German Instructor/Facilitators (n=121)

	≥ 50%	demanded level
Feedback Skill	84.5	advanced
Observing Skill	84.5	advanced
Performance Observation Skill	81.0	advanced
Coaching Skill	80.2	advanced
Adult Learning Understanding	79.3	advanced
Presentation Skill	76.7	advanced
Questioning Skill	76.7	advanced
Training and Development Theories and Techniques Understanding	75.9	intermediate
Relationship Building Skill	75.0	advanced
Objectives Preparation Skill	75.0	advanced
Group Process Skill	74.1	advanced
Self-Knowledge	70.7	advanced
Intellectual Versatility	64.7	intermediate
Negotiation Skill	59.5	intermediate
Competency Identification Skill	59.5	intermediate

Comparison between the German and the American Role Profile of the Instructor/ Facilitator. The eleven ASTD roles are functional groupings of outputs. To each of these roles belongs an unique list of outputs. The outputs of the German *Instructor/Facilitator* were compared with the outputs of the ASTD *Instructor/Facilitator*.

The comparison between the competencies demanded from the German *Instructor/Facilitator* and the same ASTD role, shows a substantial resemblance (table 7).

Table 6 Outputs German Instructor/Facilitator and ASTD Role

Outputs Instructor/facilitator	German Role		ASTD role
Presentation of Material		x	x
Functioning Equipment		x	
Concepts, Theories, or Models of Development or Change		x	
Facilitations of structured Learning Events	x	x	
Feedback to Learners		x	x
Test Delivery and Feedback			x
Transfer of Development or Career Planning Skills to the Learner	x		
Facilitation of Group Discussions		x	x
Behavior Change from a Counseling/Advising Relationship		x	
Resolved Conflicts for an Organization or Groups		x	
Information on Future Forces and Trends		x	
On-site Programme Support and Staff Management		x	
Facilitations of Media-Based Learning Events		x	
Instructor/Facilitator Guides		x	
Group members' Awareness of their own Group Process		x	x
Individuals with new Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes.			x
Learning Environment			x
Individual Action Plans for Learning Transfer	x	x	

Table 7 Competencies demanded from Instructor/Facilitator

Competencies	German role		ASTD role	
Technical				
Adult Learning Understanding	x		x	
Competency Identification Skill	x			
Objectives Preparation Skill		x		x
Performance Observation Skill	x		x	
Subject Matter Understanding				x
Training and Development Theories and Techniques Understanding		x		x
Interpersonal				
Coaching Skill		x		x
Feedback Skill		x		x
Group Process Skill		x		x
Negotiation Skill		x		
Presentation Skill		x		x
Questioning Skill		x		x
Relationship Building Skill		x		x
Intellectual				
Self-Knowledge		x		x
Intellectual Versatility	x		x	
Observing Skill		x		x

Conclusions

Despite the preliminary character of the data some conclusions can be made at this stage. Most of the conclusions only involve the role of Instructor/Facilitator and should be interpreted carefully.

New or changed Roles. The data don't give enough support to conclude that there are new or

changing roles in HRD. Still, 36.5% of the respondents had the impression that their job contained something more than the eleven ASTD roles. This is partially explicable because HRD practitioners function within the larger field of the Human Resource Management and the boundaries around HRD are not always clear. Besides this, the two potential new roles of the *Merchant* and the *Coach* remain. For both roles no reliable role profile could be compiled because of the low representation. Therefore no judgment can be made whether they are new roles or not. Further, roles were mentioned as being new, while comparable to the existing ASTD roles. This might indicate that the role definitions of the ASTD roles do not harmonize (or do not harmonize anymore) with the German roles.

Roles of German HRD Practitioners. The role of *Instructor/Facilitator* was mentioned most often as role that takes up most working time and was part of all the combinations of roles that were found. According to McLagan (1989), competencies determine the roles and range of outputs that a person can perform. Jobs that include roles with dissimilar competencies require people with a broad range of competencies. The role combinations found in this survey point in this direction. The role of *Instructor/Facilitator* was often combined with the roles of *Organization Change Agent*, *Needs Analyst*, and *Program Designer*, roles that according to McLagan require few similar competencies. The jobs of external working *Instructor/Facilitator* seem to be broader than the jobs of internal working *Instructor/Facilitator*.

Comparison between the ASTD role of the Instructor/Facilitator and the German Role. The role profile of the *Instructor/Facilitator*, the only role profile that could be established, shows great similarity in required competencies but large differences in outputs compared to the ASTD profile. The German role profile shows a broad but very traditional role.

References

Alt, C., Sauter, E., & Tillman, H. (1994). *Berufliche Weiterbildung in Deutschland: Strukturen und Entwicklungen.* (Bericht nach Artikel 11 (2) des EG-Ratsbeschlusses vom 29 Mai 1990 über das Force-Aktionsprogramm). Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung, Der Generalsekretär. Bielefeld:Bertelsmann.

Arnold, R., & Huge, W. (1990). Berufsrollen und Professionalisierung in der betrieblichen Weiterbildung. *Berufsbildung in Wissenschaft und Praxis.* 19(4), pp.10-14.

Bardeleben, R. von, Böll, G., Drieling, C., Gnahs, D., Seusing, B., & Walden, G. (1990). Strukturen beruflicher Weiterbildung: Analyse des beruflichen Weiterbildungsangebots und -bedarfs in ausgewählten Regionen. *Berichte zur beruflichen Bildung.* (Vol. 114). Berlin:Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung, Der Generalsekretär.

Feuchthofen J.E., & Severing E. (Eds). (1995). *Grundlagen der Weiterbildung: Qualitätsmanagement und Qualitätssicherung in der Weiterbildung.* Berlin: Luchterhand.

Ginkel, K. van, Mulder, M., & Nijhof, W.J. (1994). *Role Profiles of HRD Professionals in the Netherlands.* Paper presented at IRNETD, Milan, June 1994. Enschede: University of Twente.

Marsick, V. J & Watkins, K.E. (1992). Building the learning organisation: a new role for human resource developers. *Studies in Continuing Education,* 14 (2), pp. 115-129.

McLagan, P.A., & Suhadolnik, D. (1989). *Models for HRD practice: The research report.* Alexandria: American Society for training and Development.

McLagan, P.A. (1989). *Models for HRD Practice: The models.* Washington D.C.: American Society for Training and Development.

Nadler, L. (1980). *Corporate Human Resource Development: A Management Tool.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, ASTD.

Rijk, R.N. de, Mulder, M. & Nijhof, W.J. (1994). *Role profiles of HRD Practitioners in 4 European countries.* Paper presented at IRNETD, Milan, June 1994. Enschede: University of Twente.

Siegers, J. (1995). Qualitätsmanagement in der Weiterbildung: Aufgabe für das betriebliche Bildungs- und Personalwesen: Herausforderung für Weiterbildungsträger. In : J. E. Feuchthofen & E. Severing (Eds.), *Grundlagen der Weiterbildung: Qualitätsmanagement und Qualitätssicherung in der Weiterbildung.* (pp.40-44). Berlin: Luchterhand.

HRD Roles in Finland - Preliminary Results

Tuija Valkeavaara
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

To investigate the typical roles of Finnish HRD practitioners, a survey based on ASTD Models for HRD was conducted (N=461). According to preliminary data the Model seems to be valid in Finnish context. The most important HRD roles in Finland seem to be similar to the roles in other European countries. The role of organizational change agent as the most frequently chosen important role reflects the current situation in working life. Organizational work context and educational background did not seem to be associated with the role.

In Finland human resources development (HRD) has been more and more recognized as an important investment in the world of work. Especially the recent worldwide changes in working life like technological developments, melting of the hierarchies into flatter and flexible organizations, customer and quality orientation and change in values and attitudes towards work (Achtenhagen, 1994; Kasvio, 1994) have had a strong impact on this increased importance. These changes have stimulated new, human resources development oriented responses and interventions in workplaces and increased HRD's strategic importance in organizations (Juhela, 1994). The increased interest can also be seen in statistics, which show that between 1982 and 1989 the amount of employees that were provided training increased from 565 000 to 900 000, in 1991 the amount was almost 800 000 which was about 42% of the total labor force (Statistics Finland 1993).

The development of theory and practice of HRD in work organizations in Finland during the last few decades can be described by using the definition of HRD by Nadler & Nadler (1991). Basically HRD has been development of skills, knowledge and attitudes of employees by organizing learning experiences. This activity has been provided by employers. In the beginning of the eighties HRD was seen as a new and specified area of adult education which is closely related to working life. Characteristic for HRD was that the main area of activity was training, which was focused on the development of functional and ideological qualifications in the present job. The qualifications were defined by the organization (Virkkunen, 1980, 101-102; Nadler & Nadler 1991, 4). The main purposes of HRD were to create, maintain and develop the work related competencies of the employees and the cooperation and communication in an organization. One specific feature of HRD was that adult educational theory played a significant role as a theoretical foundation. Even though HRD was seen as one part of the personnel management in an organization, it was seen as an activity which is focused on intentional and formal learning and even incorporating a pedagogical or andragogical perspective into management of organizations (Miettinen & Virkkunen 1981, 3-6).

Towards the nineties the orientation has changed more from training to development (Nadler & Nadler 1991, 4) and at the same time from traditional to strategic HRD (Rothwell & Kazanas 1994, 16-18). The main purposes of HRD are now focused on facilitating the ability to learn and develop on the job on the individual, group and organizational levels and to meet the changes in a creative way (Vepsäläinen 1994, 67-72). Development and learning oriented HRD interventions based on concepts like "learning organization" can be assumed to have an impact on the role of HRD and HRD practitioners in work organizations. Probably the role of a deliverer of training is not enough any longer since today's flexible organizations with lean production demands the role of and competencies in facilitating the change and supporting an organization's ability to learn (see e.g. Watkins & Marsick 1992).

One way to investigate the HRD function in work organizations is through the roles of the HRD practitioners. HRD practitioners are hired full time HRD jobs or positions or other jobs and positions where they have to part time deal with HRD issues. Role is the personal approach that practitioners have in their job in certain organizational contexts. Roles are behaviors associated with a job and they show which values or theories guide the job (Sredl&Rothwell 1987, 57-58). For example HRD practitioners can be said to be in the positions where they have to constantly identify the needs for

© *copyright, T. Valkeavaara, 1996*

changes and learning and to work with the needs and facilitate the change. That can then show in their behavior and values in the job. Almost all the research and writing about HRD practitioners' roles and competencies emanates from the USA (see e.g. Pinto & Walker 1978; McLagan & Bedrick 1983; McLagan 1989). Especially the ASTD research on the Models for HRD carried out by McLagan (1989) has been widely used as a model for investigating the roles of HRD practitioners (e.g. de Rijk, Mulder & Nijhof 1994; van Ginkel, Mulder & Nijhof 1994). The ASTD research is based on job analysis methodology and has produced descriptions of HRD functions, tasks and roles.

In Finland, especially the HRD practitioners in the public administration have been studied. Those studies have focused on the functions and tasks and to some extent on the roles and the educational and theoretical background of HRD practitioners. The development of the functions and tasks of HRD practitioners in public administration have been described as a change from designing and organizing training to an investigative facilitator or instructor (Venna & Rautiainen 1990, 161-164). Even though there are no formal degree programs in HRD, it seems that among the HRD practitioners in public administration educational theory has recently played an increasingly significant role as a theoretical foundation for work. The amount of educational or adult educational studies has increased from 10% to 80% over the period from the eighties to the nineties. The HRD practitioners have estimated that in the nineties their functions will be more holistic in the organization, including the roles of consultant, expert and coordinator of development and change agent (Suurpää & Valkeavaara 1992, 75-82).

Although in Finland research has been devoted to HRD functions and tasks, not so much is known about the HRD roles. There is also little research based information about HRD practitioners both in private and public sectors. This research will present the preliminary results of a survey conducted among the HRD practitioners in order to examine which are the typical roles, outputs and competencies of HRD practitioners and which organizational and personal (educational background) factors possibly determine the roles of HRD practitioners. In this study the analysis of HRD practitioners' work is done adopting the Models for HRD (McLagan 1989, 2-11) where job analysis consists of a role analysis and a description of the possible job contents and the competencies required to fulfill the described job. The role analysis lists a detailed descriptions of 11 roles and the role contents that can be distinguished within a job. To identify the job content the model concentrates on outputs, since they are controllable products and services that HRD practitioners are paid to produce or deliver. The outputs are also grouped according to roles. The competencies in this model are linked to the outputs in HRD work and HRD practitioners need to have them and acquire them in order to perform. These competencies are grouped into technical, business, interpersonal and intellectual competencies that are typical to the field of HRD. On the basis of this model it is possible to develop typical job profiles for HRD practitioners by connecting the role and the related outputs and competencies into profiles.

Research Questions

Four main research questions were addressed in this study: 1) Who are the HRD practitioners in Finland, what kind of is the educational background and the organizational work context of HRD practitioners? 2) Which are the most important roles in HRD practitioners' work, which are the mostly produced outputs and which are the most important competencies, what kind of role profiles are found? 3) Are there any other roles than those described in the model that can be identified in the HRD work and are they important? and 4) Are the roles related to different organizational work contexts and educational background?

Method

Target population. The target population in this study was the HRD practitioners working in the field of HRD in different work organizations in private and public sectors and in the different branches of industry in Finland. The exact group of HRD practitioners in Finland is difficult to define due to lack of formal training in the field and due to lack of common work titles. Some idea of the total amount of the practitioners who might work in the field of HRD is given by the following examination of the statistics. Since HRD is seen as a part of the adult education system in Finland, HRD practitioners are

identified as one typical group of adult educators (National council for Adult education 1989, 4-7). According the 1990 statistics (Finland Statistics 1993) out of all the adult educators about 3000 persons can be placed under the work title of "training manager" which includes automatic data processing (ADP) trainers, marketing trainers, consultants, training managers, program designers and teaching managers (Statistics Finland 1987). The category of "other trainers" includes about 4000 persons. For example in the study of the Finnish HRD practitioners in the public sector, the most frequently used work titles were program designer, training manager and trainer (Suurpää & Valkeavaara 1992, 79). In addition, persons working as HRD managers (3300) might also to some extent be involved in HRD function.

Sample. As the definition of the target population is complicated in this study, members from two professional associations were used as the target population. The two associations are The Finnish Association for Human Resource Management (Henry ry., N=776) and The Association for Trainers in Public Administration (Julkishallinnon kouluttajat ry., N=265). The use of professional associations helps to identify the members of the target population, although at the same time there is a risk of selecting a biased sample since members of association may differ in important respects from non-members (Borg & Gall 1989, 218). The associations are voluntary and their aim is to promote the professional development of their members and the professional discussion in the field. Thus, the use of these associations as representatives of the whole profession may be a benefit, since the members can be assumed to be the ones who are interested in defining the role and expertise of their own work. The sample (N=700) was selected from the membership directories of both associations. The sample includes all the members of the Association for Trainers in Public Administration (N=239) except those who were also members of the other association in this study. The sample from the Finnish Association for Human Resource Management (N=461) was selected on the basis of whether the member had allowed her/his contact addresses for non-association purposes. In both cases those who were pre-tested were left out.

Instrument. The questionnaire employed in this study was based on the HRD model of McLagan (McLagan 1989), which permits the investigation of the roles, outputs, competencies in HRD work from the HRD practitioners' point of view. It also was similar, with some adaptations, to the questionnaire used in the HRD profession for the 90's research project at the University of Twente. The questionnaire consists of five sections: 1) description of job, 2) roles within job 3) outputs within the role that takes up most of the working time 4) competencies within the role that takes up most of the working time and 5) educational background and work experience. The questionnaire required the respondent to describe her/his work, educational background and work experience and to indicate the roles in the work and especially the role that takes up most of the working time and outputs and competencies in that role. It was expected that on the basis of results, it will be possible to find out the typical role profile for the HRD practitioner in Finland.

The terms used for roles, outputs and competencies (McLagan 1989) in the questionnaire were translated into Finnish. The questionnaire was pre-tested in Spring 1995 by interviewing four experts in the field of HRD in Finland and by sending the questionnaire for the pretest sample (N=27) consisting of participants of a Program Design Course for HRD practitioners. The response rate in pretest was 35%. On the basis of the interviews and the pretest feedback some adaptations were made in the content of the questionnaire and in the placing of the questions in order to make the questionnaire clearer and easier to answer. The questionnaire was also discussed and evaluated in cooperation with the HRD profession for the 90' research project at the University of Twente in order to achieve comparability between data collected from different European countries.

Procedure. Each of the 776 members of The Finnish Association for Human Resources Management was mailed a letter in the beginning of October 1995 informing about the research and encouraging the members to participate. Selected 461 participants were mailed the questionnaire in the end of November 1995. Due to a changed timetable of sending the membership newsletters within the Association for Trainers in Public Administration the questionnaires for 239 participants will be sent in January 1996. By the 15th of December 1995 the response rate was 15% (N=69). The data received from those respondents are used in this paper as preliminary data. These data were analyzed by using the SPSS statistical program. Since only preliminary data were available, analysis focused on description, by counting frequencies and summarizing the results.

Results

Since only the preliminary data (response rate 15%, N=69) from one of the two associations selected in this study were available, the results should be viewed as tentative. Also, at this phase of the study, it is hard to estimate how representative of the total association the sample was. All the respondents (N=69), who were involved in HRD tasks to some extent, were included in the analysis.

Description of the preliminary response group. The preliminary response group included more males (55,9%) than females (44,1%), with 1 respondent providing no information on gender. More than half of the respondents (52,2%) were 45-54 years old, 29% were between 35-44 years and 18,8% were 55 years or more. Since the association investigated represents the private sector also the majority of respondents (75%) came from the private sector, while 23,6% represented municipal and state administration. The main branches of industry and business that the respondents represented were manufacturing (31,1%), education and research (26,2%) and finance and insurance (11,5%), 8 respondents did not provide information on the branch of industry and business.

Types of HRD practitioners. Employed as an internal HRD practitioner (responsible for the HRD function in their own organization) worked 68,3% and as an external HRD practitioner (in organizations offering HRD products) worked 31,7% of the respondents. The information was missing in six cases. Half of the internal HRD practitioners spent 50% or more of their working time on HRD tasks, one third spent 24% or less. More than half (56,5%) of the external HRD practitioners spent 50% or more and 17,7% less than 24% of their working time on HRD tasks. The formal job titles range from trainer/teacher to manager. The category "other manager" including executive, project, quality, district, research etc. manager was the largest (36,8%) among the respondents. HRD managers constituted 22,1% and HRM managers 17,6% of the respondents. The majority of internal HRD practitioners worked as a HRM or other manager and about half of the external HRD practitioners worked as a trainer or consultant, about one fourth as a HRM or other manager. It appears that internal HRD practitioners work more in another capacity than as specific HRD managers and time spent on HRD tasks can vary from 100% to under 10%. External HRD practitioners work more as trainers or consultants than as managers, which describes the actual nature of their work. This result suggests that the HRD function in organizations is more frequently located into HRM departments or on executive level than traditionally into specified HRD departments.

Educational background. The level of education among the HRD practitioners is high, since 82,6% of the respondents had a university degree and 8,6% had a post-graduate university degree. The educational background of the HRD practitioners ranges from technical and natural sciences to education and adult education. Economics and business studies seem to serve as the most common educational background in HRD work, since 29,9% of the respondents named those as their field of education. Administration studies had been pursued by 14,9% and educational or adult educational studies only by 10,4%. This is not consistent with the earlier findings in the public administration that educational sciences are a significant theoretical background in HRD work.

Almost all of the respondents (97,1%) had ten years or more of experience after their education and 72,5% had worked those years in the field of HRD. The HRD practitioners seem to be well experienced in the world of work in general and in their own field. Professional further education in the field of HRD seems to play an important role among the HRD practitioners since 75,4% of the respondents mentioned that they have had some further professional education, which has increased their professional competencies in HRD. Most often as such further education was cited various professional development training in HRD issues, adult education and training methods (14,8%) and special "trainer training" (10,5%). About one third of the respondents could not name any special further education but just a collection of different seminars, conferences etc. Even though educational sciences were not very common in the educational background, their role in further professional development seems to be important.

Roles, outputs, competencies. The five roles from the roles of McLagan (1989) that were most frequently used by respondents in responses describing the HRD work were organizational change agent (83,3%), needs analyst (69,1%), marketer (54,4%), instructor/facilitator (44,1%) and program designer (44,1%). In addition, 33,9% of the respondents thought that there were other roles than the ones used by McLagan that can be used to describe the HRD work. On the basis of the responses three new roles that can describe the HRD work were identified: the roles of coach (the role of coaching,

encouraging and supporting individuals and work groups in different stages of work and development of work), reflective practitioner (the role of supporting reflective thinking and learning on the individual, work group and organizational levels) and consultative communicator (the role of communicating between employees and management and integrating the aims of human resources and organization).

The most important role in HRD work was identified by asking which role takes the most of the working time. Table 1 presents those most frequently chosen HRD roles.

Table 1. The HRD roles that take most of the working time (N=69)

Organizational change agent - The role of influencing and supporting changes in organizational behavior.	31,9%
HRD manager - The role of supporting and leading a group's work and linking that work with the total organization.	14,5%
Program designer - The role of preparing objectives, defining content and selecting and sequencing activities for a specific intervention.	11,6%

Approximately one fourth of the respondents (24,6%) spent half or more and 43,5% spent 25-49% of their working time in the most important role. The respondents were also asked whether there is a role that does not necessarily take most of the working time but is in other ways the most important and meaningful in the HRD work. The role that was most frequently chosen in this question was again the organizational change agent (50%). The new roles were chosen in both cases only by a few of the respondents. The role of organizational change agent and appearance of new roles appear to confirm the assumption that the HRD function is more and more focused on facilitating the change in a creative way and supporting individuals' and organization's ability to learn.

Table 2 presents the key outputs by HRD practitioners in their role that takes most of their time in HRD work. The table shows the most commonly chosen outputs that are realized by 70% or more of the respondents (there were altogether 35 outputs that were chosen by half or more of the respondents). The outputs marked with a * -sign are consistent with the outputs of organizational change agent (McLagan 1989), which was also the most frequently chosen role among the HRD practitioners.

Table 2. Outputs by Finnish HRD practitioners in % (N=69)

Recommendations to management regarding HRD systems	84,1 *
Teams	79,7 *
Concepts, theories, or models of development or change	78,3
Designs for change	76,8 *
HRD policy	75,4
Client awareness of relationships within and around the organization	72,5 *
Presentation of material	71,0 *

Table 3 presents the most important competencies that HRD practitioners need to have in order to perform in the role that takes most of the working time and the level of expertise needed in each competency. Only the competencies that are valued very important by 60% or more by the respondents are included. The level of expertise is chosen by the majority of respondents, which valued the competency very important.

Table 3. The core competencies of Finnish HRD practitioners (in %)

1. Adult learning understanding(N=67)	68,7	intermediate
2. Business understanding(N=67)	77,6	advanced
3. Organization behavior understanding(N=65)	60,0	advanced
4. Organization understanding(N=65)	72,3	advanced
5. Feedback skill(N=67)	67,2	advanced
6. Presentation skill(N=65)	64,6	advanced
7. Visioning skill(N=66)	66,7	intermediate
8. Data reduction skill(N=67)	68,7	advanced

It seems that business competencies (2., 3., 4.) and interpersonal competencies (5.,6.) play a significant role in HRD practitioners' job and they have to be mastered on an advanced level, which means broad and deep understanding and skills and functioning in complex, varied situations. This result suggest that adult learning understanding is not so significant as business competencies, even though professional further education in training and development is common among HRD practitioners.

Table 4. Role profile for organization change agent

Organization change agent (N=22)

Outputs: presentation of material, strategies for analyzing individual or organizational functioning, concepts, theories or models of development or change, sales/business leads, HRD policy, behavior change from a counseling/advising relationship, resolved conflicts for an organization or groups(*), information on future forces and trends, changes in group norms, values culture(*), teams(*), designs for change(*), plans to implement organizational change(*), HRD long-range plans, recommendations to management regarding HRD systems(*), recommendations for needed change in individual, work group or organizational performance, implementation of change strategies(*)

Competencies: business understanding, organization understanding, feedback skill, negotiation skill, presentation skill, data reduction skill and visioning skill

Table 4 presents the role profile of the organizational agent. Outputs and very important competencies chosen by 70% or more of the respondents are taken into the profile. Table shows that the role profile is quite consistent with the role profile of organizational change agent in Models for HRD, but the Finnish HRD practitioners chose more outputs. However, 7 out of nine outputs of organizational change agent are included in the profile (marked with *). There were less (very important) competencies chosen, but all of them belong to the role profile of organizational change agent (McLagan 1989, 52).

Despite the fact that the preliminary data were too small for reliable testing of possible associations between variables, chi-square test was used in preliminary testing to describe the possible association between some variables. Even though categories were amalgamated in order to increase the reliability and validity, the data appeared to be too small in some cases. Table 5 shows that variables describing organizational work context and educational background seemed not to be associated with the choice of a HRD role, in this case organizational change agent. Also sex had no significant effects in interaction with form of employment and educational background on the choice of organizational change agent as an important role. These results have to be taken only as indicative, no final conclusions can be based on these results. However, there seems to be a tendency for working sector(private, public) and field of professional further education to be related to the role of the organizational change agent. Analysis with the final data will give the possibility to test these tendencies of associations and non-associations.

Table 5. Chi-Square test of the role of organizational change agent by form of employment, formal job title, working sector, line of business and industry, educational background, professional further education, field of professional further education.

	organizational change agent			
	chi	DF	sig.	N
employed	.32	1	.57	63
formal job title	1.13	2	.57	68
working sector	1.45	1	.23	67
line of business and industry	3.35	2	.67	42
educational background	1.41	3	.70	66
professional further education	.002	1	.96	65
field of professional further education	5.23	2	.07	29

Discussion

This research investigated the HRD function in Finland through the roles of HRD practitioners. Typical role profiles with roles, outputs and competencies according to the ASTD Models for HRD were searched. The findings show that the most important role for HRD practitioners was the role of organizational change agent. This result is consistent with earlier results of role profile studies in Europe, except that the role of instructor/facilitator was not among the three most frequently chosen most important roles. The role profile was quite consistent with the Models for HRD. Also three new roles describing the HRD work were identified on the basis of data: coach, reflective practitioner and consultative communicator. The HRD practitioners seem to be internally directed more to HRM or other managerial positions than to specified HRD positions. External HRD practitioners worked most as consultants or trainers. In terms of educational background business and administration studies were more common than educational studies, this was also seen in competencies which were chosen as very important in HRD work. Organizational and personal variables (educational background, sex) did not seem to be associated with the role.

One possible conclusion is that the role of organizational change agent reflects the current situation in the world of work, where HRD practitioners work in the positions where they have to constantly identify the need for changes and to facilitate the changes. Also the appearance of the new roles confirms that HRD functions are characterized to some extent with supporting change processes and reflective thinking and learning. The positions of internal HRD practitioners also seem to be consistent with the idea of a strategic position of HRD in organizations. The result that organizational work context and educational background are not associated with the role of organizational change agent can be explained by assuming that current trends in working life are general and experience in work has more impact on HRD roles than original educational background. On the other hand the field of professional further education showed some tendency to be associated with the role.

This study has taken a step in the direction of defining the field of HRD in Finland through the eyes of HRD practitioners. Since these results reported here are only tentative due to the small preliminary response group, restricted mainly to the private sector, it is possible of course that analysis with final data may produce different results.

After the analysis of the final data it is important to take one step further from defining the field by role analysis to investigating the nature of HRD expertise in more qualitative sense. Even though this kind of analysis gives a good information about the workplace performance and expertise (see e.g. Swanson 1995, 100), it is important to focus on results and effectiveness of the HRD functions and on HRD as a process of expertise. The HRD practitioners work constantly in change processes which are characterized by reflectivity and progressive problem solving (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1993, 82-100), thus process oriented investigation of HRD expertise is needed.

References

Achtenhagen, F. (1994). How should research on vocational and professional education react to new challenges in life and in the workplace? In Nijhof, W. J., & Streumer, J. N. (Eds.) *Flexibility in vocational education and training* (pp. 201-247). Utrecht:Lemma.

Bereiter, C. Scardamalia, M. (1993). *Surpassing ourselves. An inquiry into the nature and implications of expertise*. Illinois: Open Court.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction*. (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Ginkel, K. van, Mulder, M., & Nijhof, W. (1994, June). *Role profiles of HRD practitioners in the Netherlands*. Paper presented at the IRNETD conference, Milan.

Juhela, A. (1994). Training strategies of industry from the perspective of life-long learning. In: Kajanto, A., & Tuomisto, J. (Eds.). *Life-long learning* (pp. 221-239). Jyväskylä: Gummerus. [In Finnish]

Kasvio, A. (1994). *The new society of work*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus. [In Finnish]

Launos, E., & Peisa, S. (1979). *Occupational analysis of personnel trainers in the public sector in Finland*. Reports from the Training Centre of the State B 6. [In Finnish]

McLagan, P. (1989). *The Models*. Alexandria: ASTD.

McLagan, P., & Bedrick, D. (1983). Models for excellence: the results of the ASTD training and development competency study. *Training and development journal 7 (6), 10-20.*

Miettinen, R., & Virkkunen, R. (1981). Teaching and learning on the job in human resources development. Reports from the Training Centre of the State B 14. [In Finnish]

Nadler, L. & Nadler, Z. (1991). *Developing Human Resources* (2nd printing.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Council for Adult Education. (1989). *Report from the Department of Adult Educators 4.* Helsinki:Author. [In Finnish]

Pinto, P., & Walker, J. (1978). What do training and development professionals really do? *Training and development journal 32 (7), 58-64.*

Rijk, R. N. de, Mulder, M., & Nijhof, W. (1994, June). *Role profiles of HRD practitioners in 4 European countries*. Paper presented at the IRNETD conference, Milan.

Rothwell, W. J., & Kazanas, H. C. (1994). *Human resource development: a strategic approach.* (rev.ed., 1st printing). Massachusetts: HRD Press Inc..

Sredl, H. J., & Rothwell, W. J. (1987). *The ASTD Reference guide to Professional training roles and competencies, Vol. 1.* Massachusetts: HRD Press Inc.

Statistics Finland. (1987). *Occupational categories*. (rev. ed.). Helsinki: VAPK. [In Finnish]

Statistics Finland. (1993). *Population census 1990: part 8*. Helsinki:Author. [In Finnish]

Suurpää, J., & Valkeavaara, T. (1992). *The present situation and the future of HRD in the public sector in Finland*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Jyväskylä. [In Finnish]

Swanson, R. (1994). *Analysis for improving performance*. San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Watkins, K., & Marsick, V. (1992). Building the learning organization: a new role for human resource developers. *Studies in continuing education 14 (2), 115-129.*

Venna, Y., & Rautiainen, S. (1990). Historical stages and perspectives of the trainer training in governmental administration. *Adult Education 10 (3), 160-166.* [In Finnish]

Vepsäläinen, K. (1994). Human resource development in demanding change situations. Helsinki: Painatuskeskus Oy. [In Finnish]

Virkkunen, J. (1980). Personnel training and trainers. In Huuhka, K., Oksanen, A., Tuomisto, J. & Virkkunen, J. (eds.). *Adult Educator* (pp. 101-130). Juva: WSOY. [In Finnish].